



Curse @cursedsalad

27 Aug · 8 tweets · [cursedsalad/status/1299070440107839493](https://twitter.com/cursedsalad/status/1299070440107839493)



Explicitly stated, the Frankfurt School was a case of liberalism for thee (goyim), tribalism for me (Jews). Were it not for a \$10K grant from the American Jewish Committee, the Jewish authors of Critical Theory would have gone broke and lost all relevance in American academia.



Keith Woods 🍀
@KeithWoodsYT



Replying to @ConceptuaJames

It is liberalism that brought critical theory to America. Liberal think tanks funded their work, a liberal social order wasn't robust enough to resist them, and the CIA used new left/Frankfurt school thought to spread American liberal hegemony as a counter to the Soviet Union.

5:59 PM · Aug 24, 2020



82



20 people are Tweeting about this

surprise of the entire Horkheimer Circle, the proposal was finally received with great enthusiasm. As Neumann recounted to Horkheimer:

I have just come back from a two hour conference that Graeber and I had with Mr. David Rosenblum, Chairman of the Public Relations Committee of the Anti-Defamation League and of the American Jewish Committee. The outcome is briefly this: It is likely that we shall get a grant of \$10,000 for the execution of the Anti-Semitism project if this sum is matched by an equal sum supplied by the Institute . . . I am confident that we have a very big chance of getting the \$10,000 and though your presence here may not be indispensable I feel, that in this situation, every step should be done to ensure a happy conclusion of our endeavors.²⁰

Despite Horkheimer's typical skepticism and his misgivings about being interrupted from the dialectics project, the Institute's director did travel to New York and met with the American Jewish Committee in September. Although Horkheimer had to return to California before a final agreement could be reached, even he had to acknowledge that the project's prospects looked better than they ever had in the past.²¹

The task of arriving at a final plan for the project was consequently left to Neumann, who negotiated the details of the collaboration with the American Jewish Committee. In October 1942, Neumann again met with David Rosenblum and this time the two spoke concretely about the logistics of such an endeavor. In anticipation of a final pitch to the executive committee of the AJC, Rosenblum wanted to have an American codirector lined up and also wanted to clarify the project's fundamental research problems. Neumann, after proposing a handful of potential codirectors, ultimately settled on Robert Lynd, who particularly appealed to Rosenblum.²² Despite Lynd's reputation as a political radical, Rosenblum saw him as precisely the kind of high-profile scholar that the AJC would appreciate.²³ The two then moved to the more substantive topic of the project's parameters and agreed that research should focus on the political function of anti-Semitism, the effect that postwar changes might have on European and American anti-Semitism, labor and anti-Semitism, and a typology of anti-Semites.²⁴

Although Horkheimer praised Neumann's efforts in their personal correspondence,²⁵ the Institute's administrators were deeply concerned about

In return for the \$10K grant, these Jews produced a report on anti-Semitism called *Studies in Prejudice* which raised their profile in America. In it, they exploited America's fetishization of liberalism, arguing that anti-Semitism must be destroyed to save liberal democracy.

becoming totalitarian.³² Such a shift signaled new dangers to worldwide Jewry and justified the need for research into this frightening development.

Like the earlier proposal's distinction between premodern and modern anti-Semitism, the nontotalitarian and totalitarian conceptions of the topic enabled the Institute to connect its broader interests in the critique of contemporary society with the topic of Nazi prejudice. The use of the term "totalitarianism" enabled the Horkheimer Circle to draw from work on the dialectics project and the theory of state capitalism, and it allowed it to make a direct appeal to American fears regarding the nation's new enemies. As the members of the Institute pointed out:

The new anti-Semitism is totalitarian. It aims not only at exterminating the Jews but also at annihilating liberty and democracy. It has become the spearhead of the totalitarian order, and the aims and function of this order can be vastly clarified by a study of anti-Semitism . . . the attacks on the Jews are not primarily aimed at the Jews but at large sections of modern society, especially the free middle classes, which appear as an obstacle to the establishment of totalitarianism. Anti-Semitism is a kind of rehearsal; when the results of the rehearsal are satisfactory, the real performance—the attack on the middle classes—takes place.³³

The Horkheimer Circle still utilized a revised Marxian analysis to see the rise of totalitarianism as a contemporary crisis within capitalist societies. The primary threat, however, no longer jeopardized merely the working class, small businesses, and free professionals. The Horkheimer Circle broadened its rhetoric to present the totalitarian menace in terms that an American audience would appreciate. It threatened liberty, democracy, and the middle class—the very foundations of American society.

As much as the new AJC proposal represented an assimilation to American interests and institutions, some elements of the project were envisioned to remain the same. Most notably, Germany was maintained as a primary focal point. Although the project reenvisioned the anti-Semitic menace to highlight its threat to the United States, National Socialism still served as the most advanced prototype of the totalitarian danger. Consequently, the Institute suggested:

Since German anti-Semitism is more fully developed than any other, the case of Germany supplies us with the best point of departure, the best

transition vary. Some, like Helmut Dubiel, minimize the importance of the change. Dubiel prefers to de-emphasize the empirical research projects and instead focuses on the theoretical production of the *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. At the same time that Critical Theory had abandoned its revolutionary audience and the members of the Institute were fashioning philosophical and cultural critiques largely for themselves, there was mysteriously no attempt to mediate empirical research with theory, as was the case during the group's earlier history.⁴¹ Martin Jay, by contrast, convincingly suggests that the Horkheimer Circle grew increasingly more comfortable with empirical research as it learned more about it during the American sojourn.⁴² Rolf Wiggershaus, more cautious about the meaning of the shift, proposes two possible explanations. Recognizing that anti-Semitism had grown into the focal point of the Institute's interests by the winter of 1942–43, Wiggershaus believes that material and reputational needs forced the topic of anti-Semitism into the group's theoretical work (such as the dialectics project), or the work with the AJC served as an empirical complement to the group's philosophical speculations.⁴³ Lewis Coser, who worked with the members of the Institute on Morningside Heights, suggests that *Studies in Prejudice* might be viewed as a reconciliation with the Institute's inherent bourgeois tendencies. All came from well-to-do German families, and they had always seen themselves as radicals in Babylonian exile. The anti-Semitism project therefore most notably suggested an abandonment of revolutionary utopianism and the temporary adoption of American liberalism.⁴⁴ Peter Hohendahl and Zoltan Tar, viewing the shift in more purely intellectual terms, emphasize the significant reorientation in sociological outlook. Whereas the Institute formerly focused on the socioeconomic underpinnings of social phenomena and the structural transformation of society, *Studies in Prejudice* marked a move toward depth psychology and ideological reeducation.⁴⁵

Although elements of truth pervade all of these explanations, it is important not only to grapple with the intellectual dimensions of these decisions but also to look at them in relation to the circumstances exile produced for the Frankfurt School. When we consider the desperation arising from the Institute's plight at the end of the 1930s and at the beginning of the 1940s, it also may be possible that the members of the Horkheimer Circle undertook this transition more as passive participants than as the active molders of their own fate. When Pollock discovered the severity of the

Their report managed to link anti-Semitism to totalitarianism, which of course landed well on the post-WW2, pro-liberal, American audience. This report not only launched their careers as academics in America, it provided the financial support for their Critical Theory work.

THE EXECUTION AND RECEPTION OF
STUDIES IN PREJUDICE

The anti-Semitism project grew rapidly over the course of the 1940s and catapulted the members of the Horkheimer Circle to prominence in the

ASSIMILATION AND ACCEPTANCE

243

study of prejudice. Ironically, this initiative, which in the end was pursued largely for financial reasons as the project's content increasingly drifted away from the Institute's theoretical interests, marked the group's breakthrough in the United States. After several years of struggling to gain recognition in the United States, the work that garnered the Institute the spotlight was not a truly representative piece of Critical Theory. Instead, it manifested a clear accommodation with Anglo-American research methods and sought to combine these empirical techniques with the speculative traditions of Continental sociology.

The Institute's collaboration with the AJC moved swiftly. Unlike earlier Institute projects that either involved large teams of researchers or germinated over lengthy periods of time, the anti-Semitism project began on a shoestring budget and taxed the group's depleted staff. The Horkheimer Circle had devised an ambitious proposal and now had to deliver on its promises. Despite the intense expectations and the harried research schedule, the evolution of the project was steady and methodical. As much as Horkheimer always bemoaned the stratagems and duties of U.S. research directors, the sustained support and proliferation of *Studies in Prejudice* represented a testament to his managerial acumen.

From the beginning, Horkheimer hoped to continue his life and his work on the dialectics project in Los Angeles while the work for the AJC commenced. Consequently, he divided the anti-Semitism project into two parts. The first of these halves addressed the origins and history of totalitarian anti-Semitism. This portion of the project was run out of the New York offices of the Institute by Pollock and represented a continuation of the earlier work on German history, National Socialism, and state capitalism. Making use of these sociopolitical analyses of German society and culture that had been under way since the late 1930s, Pollock and his team sought to produce a history of German Nazism that emphasized the evolution of anti-Semitic policy.⁴⁸ The second half of the project, meanwhile, also maintained links to the Horkheimer Circle's past. This portion of the project was directed by Horkheimer in Los Angeles, and it sought to provide psychological insights regarding the rise of totalitarian anti-Semitism in the United States. Harking back to Fromm's work with the Institute on *Autorität und Familie*, the psychological analysis of totalitarian anti-Semitism recalled the successful marriage of psychology and sociology that characterized the Institute's early interdisciplinary research.⁴⁹ This half of

In fact, Critical Theory's birth is replete with Jewish tribalism. For example, these exiled Jews initially found a home at the Jew-funded New School of Social Research in NYC.



Curse
@cursedsalad



In 1933, Jewish merchant Hiram Halle donated money to the New School for Social Research in NYC to sponsor/hire the Frankfurt School academics fleeing Germany. Actor Marlon Brando attended New School. He wrote about how

influential these Jews were, and it wasn't trivial 🧐

ashamed, but they gave me an appetite to learn everything. They made me hungry for information. I believed that if I had more knowledge I'd be smarter, which I now realize isn't true. I read Kant, Rousseau, Nietzsche, Locke, Melville, Tolstoy, Faulkner, Dostoyevsky and books by dozens of other authors, many of which I never understood.

The New School was a way station for some of the finest Jewish intellectuals from Europe, a temporary haven before they left to join the faculties at universities like Princeton, Yale and Harvard. They were the cream of Europe's academicians, and as teachers they were extraordinary.

One of the great mysteries that has always puzzled me is how Jews, who account for such a tiny fraction of the world's popu-

lation, speak to them. Russian Jews were isolated from German Jews, who thought of themselves as separate and superior, and Eastern European Jews had nothing to do with the Sephardic Jews. Besides, there had been so much intermarriage over the centuries that genetics alone couldn't explain the phenomenon.

After talking to many Jews and reading about Jewish history and culture, I finally came to the conclusion that in the end being Jewish was a cultural phenomenon rather than a genetic one. It is a state of mind. There's a Yiddish word, *seychel*, that provides a key to explaining the most profound aspects of Jewish culture. It means to pursue knowledge and to leave the world a better place than when you entered it. Jews revere education and hard work, and they pass these values on from one

amazing success, along with Judaism, the one constant that survived while the Jews were dispersed around the world.

Traditions passed on via the Torah and Talmud have somehow helped Jews to fulfill the destiny they have claimed, a kind of "chosen people." If spectacular success in so many, many fields is proof of that. Whatever the reasons for their brilliance and success, I was never educated until I was exposed to them. They introduced me to a sense of culture that has lasted me a lifetime.

As well as academics and scholars from Eastern Europe, Jewish girls, most of whom were more educated, sophisticated and experienced in the ways of the world than I was, were my teachers during those early days in New York. It was common in those days for girls from wealthy New York Jewish families to rent an apartment in the city and have a little fling before

After several months in New York, I was still interested in becoming a modern dancer, but then I took an acting class at the New School's Dramatic Workshop and everything changed. During that fall of 1943, I kept my parents informed of my progress in letters that seem to have been written by a person I barely recognize, a naive kid trying hard to understand the galaxy he had stumbled into and looking for a place in it as well as a purpose in life.

Dear Folks:

I am fine, deprimed and healthy. I haven't found a room as yet but I think by the end of this week I will have gotten one that I've had my eye on... last week, we did "Tonight We



Richard Spencer @RichardBSpencer

Do we really believe that Horkheimer and Adorno had this much influence?

This "cultural Marxism" meme is really overdone.
[twitter.com/wayotworld/sta...](https://twitter.com/wayotworld/status/1188888888)

6:00 PM · Oct 9, 2019



85



39 people are Tweeting about this

Their subsequent tenure at Columbia was solely due to their private endowment, which they quickly depleted. In that short period, Columbia had lost enthusiasm in their work, so what did these tribalists do? They naturally reached out to their co-ethnics for help - i.e. the AJC.

But the AJC wasn't the only Jewish group that helped them - they were also supported by the bourgeois, Trotskyist, Jewish group, New York Intellectuals, whose most famous member, Irving Kristol, founded neo-conservatism. You might know Irving's son - the architect of the Iraq War

BERNIE SANDERS ASKED BILL KRISTOL TO APOLOGIZE FOR PUSHING THE IRAQ WAR. GUESS WHAT HAPPENED NEXT.

As the Iraq War began in 2003, Kristol, a key backer, declared that he'd be "happy to be held to a moral standard" if he was wrong. He was lying.

Jon Schwarz

May 28 2019, 1:08 p.m.

DONATE →



103



Pundit Bill Kristol at Politicon in Pasadena, Calif., on July 30, 2017. Photo: John Sciulli/Getty Images for Politicon

Most saliently, these Jew authors of Critical Theory were mentored by fellow Jew, Paul Lazarsfeld, on how to manipulate the American minds by leveraging their ideals to secure Jewish tribal interests. Lazarsfeld was known for his research on the impact of the media on elections.

from Frankfurt. On the sociological front, however, Paul Lazarsfeld provided the most assistance and may have served as a role model for the Institute.⁴⁶ Although the Horkheimer Circle suffered a long string of disappointments in the United States, Lazarsfeld had a clear record of success. Lazarsfeld had arrived at the same time as the members of the Institute, but he had come with nothing. In the same time that it had taken the Horkheimer Circle to jeopardize its existence Lazarsfeld had rapidly climbed the academic ladder to a permanent post in Columbia's sociology department and had laid the foundations for the Bureau for Applied Social Research.

Despite his partly deserved reputation as a sociological mercenary and professional opportunist, Lazarsfeld developed a successful strategy for pursuing social research in the United States. **Instead of creating theory for its own sake or only tackling those questions that interested him as a researcher, Lazarsfeld encouraged those around him to seek out socially relevant and methodologically acceptable topics that overlapped with one's theoretical, political, and epistemological agendas.**⁴⁷ If applied successfully, this strategy could provide support from U.S. sociological foundations for topics that represented the true interests of the researcher. The revised anti-Semitism proposal that gained acceptance from the AJC in March 1943 may have been the Horkheimer Circle's application of Lazarsfeld's strategy. The successful AJC grant formulated an anti-Semitic threat that was relevant to American Jewry and envisioned a methodology that was consistent with U.S. sociological practices. In addition to rescuing the Institute's finances and reputation, the money that paid for the anti-Semitism project also provided Horkheimer and Adorno with salaries that enabled them to think more generally about the topic. Consequently, the Institute for Social Research concluded the 1940s with the successful publication of *Studies in Prejudice*, as well as the completion of its theoretical masterpiece, *Dialectic of Enlightenment*.



^ Criticism

Though the research bureau was a major contribution, it was not without flaws. Lazarsfeld emphasized that a research institution is capable of existing in an organized fashion but that the commandeering and leadership really dictated the success of it. Lazarsfeld was successful for nearly two decades; however actors within this particular system could manipulate the machinations of the institution and thus derail the program. Another negative repercussion of having the type of leadership that Lazarsfeld provided was that the organization and its methodology was determined by his preferences – not allowing in this case for statistics to be utilized and that the data sets were unable to be replicated and generalized. ^[6]

The takeaway here should be liberalism's failure to stop any of this from happening, and why it was important for Jews to program Whites into believing tribalism is morally bad. Is White tribalism bad, or is White tribalism just bad for Jews?



Curse
@cursed salad



Jews have two labels for you:

- "White supremacist" if they notice your in-group favoritism
- "anti-Semite" if you notice their in-group favoritism



Robert Speer @RobertSpeer16

Replying to @cursed salad and @victorykn

I agree with Joe Sobran on the definition of an antisemite. He said an antisemite is not a person who hates Jews. An antisemite is a person Jews hate.

7:28 PM · Jun 18, 2020



♡ 1K 💬 446 people are Tweeting about this

...